

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended in a sincere effort to overcome all of the rejections of record.

The Examiner had objected to the drawings, under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing the rubbing flanks. Claim 17 has been amended to remove the reference to rubbing flanks and to recite a flank. Flanks 32 are referred to in the specification at page 10, lines 10-19, in the discussion of Figures 9 and 10. As amended claim 17 recites that the wheels are pressed together which is clearly shown in Figure 1, 4 and 5. Accordingly no new matter has been entered and it is believed that the drawings and description of the specification clearly support what is now claimed in claim 17.

The Examiner also objected to the specification as the term "rubbing flanks" was not described in the specification. Claim 17 has been amended to remove the reference to rubbing flanks but it is pointed out that the above-referenced paragraph on page 10, lines 10-19 does disclose and relate to rubbing flanks.

The Examiner also rejected claim 17-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, (second paragraph) as being indefinite and it is believed that newly amended claim 17, 21, 22 and 27 have been amended to avoid the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Examiner also rejected claims 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Greenwell et al. (5,337,887). Greenwell et al. fails to teach, suggest or disclose in any manner a conveyor system with a plurality of conveyor chains guided over sprocketed wheels which are mounted and compressed adjacent to each other on a shaft in a cluster so that the cluster of sprocketed wheels are frictionally connected with each other and connected fixedly and non-rotationally to a drive shaft so that in an uncoupled state each individual sprocketed wheel can rotate relative to the others and to the shaft. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) cannot be maintained.

The Examiner also rejected claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwell et al. in view of Malhiot (2,358,292). As noted above with respect to the rejection of claims 17-24, Greenwell et al. fails to teach a significant feature of the claimed invention which is positively recited in newly amended claim 17. Malhiot fails to rectify this deficiency in Greenwell et al. so that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) cannot be maintained.

The Examiner also rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greenwell et al. in view of Middleberg et al. (5,806,659). As noted above, Greenwell et al. fails to teach or suggest a significant feature of the invention and this deficiency is not rectified by Middleberg et al.

Application Serial No.: 09/982,584  
Attorney Docket No.: 400004-2012

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully suggested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Leonard J. Santisi  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 24,135  
(212) 588-0800